

Samoa Education Sector Independent Verification Report

FINAL

Fred Brooker
Visesio Pongi
Lili Tuioti

July, 2016

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....3

Section 1. Introduction / Background.....4

Section 2. Methodology.....5

Section 3. Recommendations9

Section 4. Summary20

Annex 1. ESP Key Performance Indicators for 2014 / 2015

Acknowledgments

1. The Team would like to thank the Government of Samoa, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia for their support and cooperation during this exercise.
2. Senior staff from the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture, the Samoa Qualifications Authority and the National University of Samoa gave much of their valuable time and insights and documentation to the team.
3. Finally, our thanks go to the Education Sector Coordination Division led by the Coordinator. In particular we want to express our gratitude to the Principal Officer for Monitoring and Evaluation for providing documentation, arranging all our meetings and providing advice when needed.

Section 1. Introduction / Background

4. The ESSP disbursements consist of **Sector Budget support** based on process indicators and **Performance-linked contributions**, subject to achievement of mutually determined performance indicators. The budget support is un-earmarked financing in support of key operational areas identified in the Samoa Education Sector Plan 2013-18 and will total 70% of the total allocation based on GOS self-assessment of achievement of fixed process indicators. The allocation for the performance linked contributions will be released based on GOS's tracking towards nine pre-determined Key Performance Indicators. This represents 30% of the total allocation and will be subject to an independent assessment.
5. The **Independent Verification Process (IVP)** for the Education Sector Support Program (ESSP) will enable the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (DFAT) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand (MFAT) to release agreed funding (30%) through a performance-linked mechanism based on Government of Samoa's (GoS) achievement of agreed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the Education Sector.
6. The performance-linked contributions are subject to achievement of mutually determined performance indicators. The financing will be released based on GoS's tracking towards nine pre-determined KPIs and subject to an independent assessment of a minimum trend of 1 percentage point toward the Plan's 2019 targets. If not all Key Performance Indicators have been met, a proportion of the 30 percent will be paid. The formula will be 11.1% of the total allocation for each of the 9 KPIs.
7. The KPIs are distributed across the education sector and the following three agencies responsible for implementation:
 - a) The **Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC)** is mandated to provide education for primary and secondary education with support provided for early childhood and special schools.
 - b) The **Samoa Qualifications Authority (SQA)** is mandated to become the overarching body to coordinate, quality assure and regulate the post school education and training sub-sector in Samoa.
 - c) The **National University of Samoa (NUS)** is responsible for the provision of tertiary education and training, including academic, technical and vocational training and continuing education.

8. The objectives of the Independent Verification Process are:

- a) Review the approved ESP Annual Review Report and supporting documentation (sources of verification) to assess the achievement of the KPIs;
- b) Provide recommendations to Australia and New Zealand on the release of the performance-linked contribution of the 9 (nine) KPIs; and,
- c) Provide recommendations to the Education Sector Agencies on improving the quality of the indicators and means of measurement in line with internationally recognized standards for the following years. This will be in a separate report.

Section 2. Methodology

9. A three-person team of independent consultants was engaged by DP's to carry out the independent verification and provide recommendations to Australia and New Zealand on the disbursement of performance-linked contributions. The team was led by the ESSP Education Quality Adviser, Fred Brooker, currently under contract by Australia and New Zealand. Visessio Pongi was engaged as the Education Assessment Expert and Lili Tuioti was engaged for the PSET indicators through New Zealand Qualifications Authority.

10. The Team Leader provided quality assurance of all outputs and deliverables, ensuring all specified requirements and performance standards were met in a timely manner. The TL compiled the final IVP report and the other two consultants were jointly responsible for a separate report on recommendations to revise and improve the KPIs for the following year.

Education Quality Adviser – Team Leader (Fred Brooker)

11. The Team Leader will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on the following three (3) Indicators:

- a) Percentage of children commencing Year 1 Primary and completing Year 8 by gender (Primary Completion Rate)
- b) Percentage of children with disability enrolled in mainstream government schools
- c) Percentage of teachers meeting teacher performance standards

Education Assessment Expert (Visessio Pongi)

12. The Assessment Expert will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on the following three (3) Indicators:

- a) Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in literacy (English & Samoan)
- b) Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in numeracy
- c) Number of schools meeting minimum service standards related to literacy and numeracy

Post-Secondary Education and Training Expert (Lili Tuioti)

13. The PSET Expert will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on the following three (3) Indicators:

- a) Percentage of PSET graduates finding employment within 6 months
- b) Transition rate from Year 13 to formal PSET
- c) Number of accredited courses provided by PSET providers

14. The work was carried out over a 3 week period from 6 June – 1 July 2016. The first phase included a desk-based review of all documentation provided by the education sector agencies through the Australian and New Zealand High Commissions.

15. A one-week field mission was carried out from 20 – 24 June. Fred Brooker and Visiesio Pongi carried out the field mission while Lili Tuioti provided support remotely.

16. The methodology for carrying included verification, review and validation of the KPIs. The definitions of the indicators and methods of calculation were reviewed and included comparison with international standards.

17. The following steps were carried out for the IVP in June 2016.

Steps	Responsible	Timeframe
1. ESAC / ESCD provides all documentation to the DPs in electronic format and provide names, title and contact details of responsible officers for reporting / data from MESC, SQA and NUS.	ESCD	6 June, 2016
2. DPs to validate all documentation from the year of reporting ¹ and provide to the IVP Team for review.	DPs	Within 1 week of receiving documentation from ESCD
3. IVP Team to carry out desk-based review of the Annual Report and all documentation (sources of verification). Consultation with education sector agencies may be done through e-mail.	IVP Team	Within 10 days of receiving documentation
4. IVP Team Leader and one member of team carry out in-country mission to validate preliminary findings and verify data and analysis.	IVP Team	20 – 24 June during in-country mission
5. Draft of IVP report produced for presentation to stakeholders. Meeting held with MoF representatives, heads of sector agencies, ESAC Chair and DPs to discuss draft report	IVP Team / DPs	20 – 24 June during in-country mission
6. IVP Team to prepare report with recommendations to revise	IVP Team	By end of in-country mission

¹ Documentation will include: Annual Review Report; MESC and SQA Statistical Bulletins; SQA Tracer Report; SPELL Report; other official reports. Publication of reports on government websites will be considered to be in the public domain.

Steps	Responsible	Timeframe
/ improve the KPIs for the following year. Report submitted to DPs and GoS for inclusion in April ESAC		
7. Finalisation of IVP Report for submission to DFAT and MFAT	IVP Team TL	1 July
8. IVP Report with recommendation on disbursement of performance-linked tranche submitted to ESAC through ESWG for approval	DPs	July ESAC
9. Recommendation Report to revise / improve KPIs for following year submitted to ESAC through ESWG for approval	ESCD	July ESAC

18. The IVP guidelines defined the following protocols:

- a) The exercise can only be carried out once the Annual Review Report has been finalized and approved by the ESAC;
- b) The Annual Review Report includes analysis of mutually determined Key Performance Indicators including trends from the previous year(s);
- c) All sources of information / verification of the selected indicators must be official documents (statistical bulletins, official reports) and publicly available;
- d) The documentation must be provided in electronic format before the IVP will take place;
- e) The relevant staff from the Education Sector agencies will be available during the in-country mission for meetings and validation of the indicators; and,
- f) The preliminary findings will be presented to the development partners and GoS officials.

19. The exercise met all of the agreed protocols.

20. All of the KPIs were tested against international best practices, including a comparison of definitions and methods of calculations used in international publications.

21. The following issues were considered and noted during the IVP:

- a) Definitions and methods of calculation – the documentation provided by the agencies included a definition and method of calculation for only 1 indicator.
- b) Sub-indicators - most of the indicators were disaggregated by gender or level (where appropriate) and as such represented sub-indicators. This led to a situation where KPIs could be partially achieved if, for example, the percent of females reached the target but males did not.
- c) Baselines – only 3 of the KPIs had fully compliant baselines established while 4 baselines were only partially compliant (lack of disaggregation or absolute number

instead of percentage) and 2 of the KPIs had no indicators provided.

- d) Official sources of data – the documentation included statistical digests and bulletins which were published and publically available. In addition, official quarterly and annual reports of the agencies were agreed if they met the criteria of being officially approved and available on a government website.

22. In view of the points noted in paragraph 17, the IVP team recommended that:

- a) the evidence of definitions and methods of calculation be waived for 2014/15
- b) partial achievement be accepted by the DPs which would allow disbursement of 50% of the allocation for a given KPI (i.e. 50% of the 11.1%) if the sector showed compliance and an agreed, but not full, achievement of the results.

23. The IVP team was able to meet with all the relevant staff during the field mission. This included an initial briefing with the senior staff from the three agencies and the development partners. The education sector agency staff fully cooperated by giving their time for meetings and discussions and provided all possible data and reports.

24. The ESCD team facilitated the in-country visit and arranged all meetings and provided data and other information as needed. Separate meetings were held with the focal points for each of the KPIs. The meetings included a review of definitions and methods of calculation; presentation of available data against both the baselines and the results; and, a discussion over any challenges.

25. A final briefing provided to the ESAC Chair, Heads of the agencies, Development Partners, and selected senior staff from the education agencies. The preliminary findings and recommendations were provided and clarifications were made where appropriate. In addition, the preliminary recommendations for improving the KPIs in the future years were also presented and discussed.

26. The following section presents each of the 9 KPIs showing the definition; original baseline and target; reported from the Annual Review Report 2014/15; data sources; achievement of the KPI; justification; recommendation to the development partners; and, technical notes.

Section 3. Recommendations

Indicator:	1. Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in literacy (English & Samoan)		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	<p><i>From ESP Document</i> Male: 35% (2012) Female: 18% (2012) Not determined by Year</p> <hr/> <p><i>From ARR 2014/15</i> <u>English Literacy (2012)</u> Year 4: Male (35%), Female (18%) Year 6: Male (55%), Female (32%) <u>Samoan Literacy (2012)</u> Year 4: Male (21%), Female (12%) Year 6: Male (19%), Female (9%)</p>	Target:	<p><i>From ESP Document</i> Male: 23% (2019) Female: 12% (2019) Not determined by Year</p> <hr/> <p><i>From ARR 2014/15</i> <u>English Literacy (2019)</u> Year 4: Male (23%), Female (6%) Year 6: Male (43%), Female (20%) <u>Samoan Literacy (2019)</u> Year 4: Male (9%), Female (1%) Year 6: Male (16%), Female (1%)</p>
Reported - actual:	<p><u>English Literacy: (Achieved 2014/15)</u> Year 4: Male (17%), Female (10%) Year 6: Male (33%), Female (19%) <u>Samoa Literacy: (Achieved 2014/15)</u> Year 4: Male (14%), Female (7%) Year 6: Male (17%), Female (8%)</p>		
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Digest 2014; MESC Statistical Digest for EFA Goals 2015; MESC Statistical Digest 2015; Annual Review Report 2014/15 (page 8)		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The crucial document necessary to complete the verification of the achievements (at risk level) reported for 2014 was not produced. With the limited information on the 2014 SPELL literacy results available in the MESC Statistical Digest 2015 (Part 2 pages 1 & 2) it was not possible to verify the format of the results reported for 2014.		

Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No clear definition of what “children at risk” means in literacy in both the base year (2012) and target Year (2014). References to the concept suggest that the indicator refers to; “Children who are enrolled at Year 4 and Year 6 in schools but are not engaged in learning and often demonstrate truancy, achievement as well as behavioral challenges. Such students are not likely to achieve the learning outcomes for literacy at both Year 4 and Year 6. Achievement-wise, these children are associated with the lowest achievement standard in the SPELL literacy progression for both Year 4 and Year 6. 2. The changes to the format of the baseline, now including disaggregation by gender (male/female), by level (Year 4/and Year 6) as well as by medium of assessment (English/Samoan) were able to be verified from the MESC Statistical Digest 2014 (Part 2 Pages 8 and 9). Based on the data given in the Annual Review Report, some of the targets set for 2019 have been achieved but need data from 2014 SPELL report to verify these achievements. 3. From the MESC Statistical Digest (2015), as well as other MESC documents, it appears that a different system was adopted in 2014 for awarding of scores as well as reporting of the 2014 SPELL literacy results. A 3-point reporting scale was used (Beginner, Competent and Advanced) compared to the 5-point scale used in 2012 for setting the baseline. While no information was available on how the ‘at risk’ level for literacy was calculated in both 2012 and 2014, analysis of the two reporting scales showed that the achievement standard considered to be ‘at risk’ in the literacy baseline was not the same as the perceived ‘at risk level’ (Beginner) in the 2014 SPELL thus making it not possible to compare progress from the base year to 2014. Even if the literacy achievements reported for 2014 were able to be verified, it would not be credible to make any comparison with the 2012 baseline as an equivalency test needed to have been carried out to ensure comparability of the literacy baseline and the achievements for 2014. 4. Although the achievements for 2014 could not be verified, anecdotal evidence indicate significant amount of progress made during 2014/15 culminating with a totally new SPELL system (new instruments and new reporting system) now in place since 2015. Because of the changes in the SPELL system from 2012 to 2014 and then 2015, it will remain a challenge to compare achievements in 2014 as well as 2015 to the baseline (2012).

Indicator:	2. Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in numeracy		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	Male: 26% (2012) Female: 16% (2012) Not determined by Year <i>From ARR 2014/15</i> <u>Numeracy (2012)</u> Year 4: Male (23%), Female (18%) Year 6: Male (39%), Female (30%)	Target:	Male: 10% (2019) Female: 5% (2019) Not determined by Year <i>From ARR 2014/15</i> <u>Numeracy:</u> Year 4: Male (10%), Female (5%) Year 6: Male (50%), Female (38%)
Reported - actual:	<u>Numeracy: (Achieved 2014/15)</u> Year 4: Male (23%), Female (18%) Year 6: Male (39%), Female (30%)		
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Bulletins 2014; MESC Statistical Digest for EFA Goals 2015; Annual Review Report 2014/15 (page 8)		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The crucial document necessary to complete the verification of the achievements (at risk level) reported for 2014 was not produced. With the limited information on the 2014 SPELL literacy results available in the MESC Statistical Digest 2015 (Part 2 pages 1 & 2) it was not possible to verify the format of the results reported for 2014.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	1. No clear definition of what “children at risk” means in both the base year (2012) and target Year (2014/15). References to the concept suggest that the indicator refers to; “Children who are enrolled at Year 4 and Year 6 in schools but are not engaged in learning and often demonstrate truancy, achievement as well as behavioral challenges. Such students are not likely to achieve the learning outcomes for literacy at both Year 4 and Year 6. Achievement-wise, these children are associated with the lowest achievement standard in the SPELL literacy progression for both Year 4 and Year 6. 2. The changes to the format of the baseline, now including disaggregation by		

	<p>gender (male/female), by level (Year 4/and Year 6) as well as by medium of assessment (English/Samoan) were able to be verified from the MESC Statistical Digest 2014 (Part 2 Pages 8 and 9). Based on the data given in the Annual Review Report, some of the targets set for 2019 have been achieved but need data from 2014 SPELL report to verify these achievements.</p> <p>3. From the MESC Statistical Digest (2015), as well as other MESC documents, it appears that a different system was adopted in 2014 for awarding of scores as well as reporting of the 2014 SPELL literacy results. A 3-point reporting scale was used (Beginner, Competent and Advanced) compared to the 5-point scale used in 2012 for setting the baseline. While no information was available on how the 'at risk' level for literacy was calculated in both 2012 and 2014, analysis of the two reporting scales showed that the achievement standard considered to be 'at risk' in the literacy baseline was not the same as the perceived 'at risk level' (Beginner) in the 2014 SPELL thus making it not possible to compare progress from the base year to 2014. Even if the literacy achievements reported for 2014 were able to be verified, it would not be credible to make any comparison with the 2012 baseline as an equivalency test needed to have been carried out to ensure comparability of the literacy baseline and the achievements for 2014.</p> <p>4. Although the achievements for 2014 could not be verified, anecdotal evidence indicate significant amount of progress made during 2014/15 culminating with a totally new SPELL system (new instruments and new reporting system) now in place since 2015. Because of the changes in the SPELL system from 2012 to 2014 and then 2015, it will remain a challenge to compare achievements in 2014 as well as 2015 to the baseline (2012).</p>
--	--

Indicator:	3. Percentage of PSET graduates finding employment within 6 months (<i>gender disaggregated rates to be determined in first year of ESSP</i>)		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	Average: 31% (2006) Not determined by gender	Target:	Average: 70% Not determined by gender
Reported - actual:	Average: 63%		
Data source(s):	Annual Review Report 2014/15 (page 11); PSET Statistical Bulletin		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The data verifying the baseline was not available but the results achieved are provided in the 2015 PSET Statistical Bulletin. The baseline was not updated to be disaggregated by gender and the original baseline has a very low sample of only 6 providers from 2006. The results in the Bulletin are also not gender disaggregated and the result is 59% (not the 63% in the ARR).		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse 50% of the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and validate definitions and method of calculation (<i>note SQA tracer study has been updated with greater coverage and NUS tracer not yet started.</i>) 2. Most recent SQA statistical bulletin published March 2015. But it simply updates on the graduates surveyed in the 2013 survey, doesn't reference any new group of graduates. 3. Can validate method, but not any progress toward meeting targets. 		

Indicator:	4. Percentage of children commencing Year 1 Primary and completing Year 8 by gender (Primary Completion Rate MDG 2)		
Definition:	The percentage of students sitting the national exams is a measure of completion rates, e.g. percentage of students sitting the Year 8 exam is a measure of how many students starting Year 8 actually complete Year 8. (from MESC Statistical Bulletin)		
Baseline:	Male: 86% (2014) Female: 85% (2014)	Target:	Male: 95% (2019) Female: 95% (2019)
Reported - actual:	Male: 86% (2014) Female: 85% (2014)		
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Bulletin 2015; Annual Review Report 2014/2015		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The year of reporting and baseline are the same. MESC does not have a publicly available document providing the Completion Rate in 2015. The indicator is not included in the Statistical Bulletin. The definition used is not internationally accepted.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Baselines presented are not found in the MESC Stat Bulletin. 2. The Stat Digest for 2014 with data from 2013 should have been used as the baseline. There is data in this report but not disaggregated in line with the indicators presented in the baseline. 3. The MESC is not using the international calculation method provided by UIS: <i>Divide the number of graduates from primary education in a given year by the difference between enrolment in the last grade in the same year and repeaters in the last grade in the following year, and multiply the result by the survival rate to the last grade of primary education in the given year and by 100.</i> http://glossary.uis.unesco.org/glossary/en/term/2632/en 4. The above definition is also used in the Samoa Statistical Digest on EFA Goals – 2015. 		

Indicator:	5. Transition rate from Year 13 to formal PSET (<i>target to be confirmed in year 1 of ESSP</i>)																																		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.																																		
Baseline:	Male: 37% (2012) Female: 63% (2012)	Target:	Male: 50% (2019) Female: 70% (2019)																																
Reported - actual:	Average: 69%																																		
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Bulletin 2015; PSET Statistical Bulletin 2015; NUS Reports																																		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved																																
Justification:	The baseline has not been confirmed (as indicated in the KPI table) and the Annual Review Report has a different baseline with a result that cannot be found in the data sources, nor is it disaggregated by gender. The method of calculation is not correct (it is showing breakdown of gender in the foundation year of PSET providers and not the percentage of students who have found study places following grade 13)																																		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation																																		
Technical notes:	<p>1. The baseline provided in the Annual Review Report is 65% and not disaggregated by gender, which is different that the baseline in the KPI table. Note that the baseline has not been confirmed as indicated.</p> <p>2. The calculations below were done from the available data and show the real transition rates (highlighted)</p> <table> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>2012 Year 13 Enrol</th><th>2013 PSET Enrol Foundation</th><th>Transition Rates</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>2,015</td><td>772</td><td>38%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Male</td><td>932</td><td>376</td><td>40%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Female</td><td>1,083</td><td>396</td><td>37%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>2013 Year 13 Enrol</th><th>2014 PSET Enrol Foundation</th><th>Transition Rates</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>2,032</td><td>729</td><td>36%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Male</td><td>878</td><td>240</td><td>27%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Female</td><td>1,154</td><td>489</td><td>42%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				2012 Year 13 Enrol	2013 PSET Enrol Foundation	Transition Rates	Total	2,015	772	38%	Male	932	376	40%	Female	1,083	396	37%		2013 Year 13 Enrol	2014 PSET Enrol Foundation	Transition Rates	Total	2,032	729	36%	Male	878	240	27%	Female	1,154	489	42%
	2012 Year 13 Enrol	2013 PSET Enrol Foundation	Transition Rates																																
Total	2,015	772	38%																																
Male	932	376	40%																																
Female	1,083	396	37%																																
	2013 Year 13 Enrol	2014 PSET Enrol Foundation	Transition Rates																																
Total	2,032	729	36%																																
Male	878	240	27%																																
Female	1,154	489	42%																																

Indicator:	6. Percentage of children with disability enrolled in mainstream government schools		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	Number 105 Male: Not determined Female: Not determined	Target:	150 Male: Not determined Female: Not determined
Reported - actual:	The Annual Review Report did not provide and information or data on children with disability.		
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Bulletin 2015; Annual Review Report 2014/2015		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	MESC does not have a publicly available document providing the percentage / number of children with disability in 2015. The indicator is not included in the Annual Review Report or in the Statistical Bulletin.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The baseline is not reported by percentage. 2. While there is no reporting in the Annual Review Report or the MESC Statistical Bulletin, there are 16 mentions of 'disability' in the <i>Samoa Education for All 2015 National Review</i>. However, this document also does not provide any statistics. 3. A definition for children with disability in the Samoan context was not found in any of the documentation provided. 4. Data has been collected in 2014, 2015 and 2016 but is not presented in any official documentation. Additionally, the data does not show and increase in the enrolments of children with disability. 		

Indicator:	7. Percentage of teachers meeting teacher performance standards		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	Male: Not determined Female: Not determined	Target:	Male: Not determined Female: Not determined
Reported - actual:	Average: 29% (primary teachers of those appraised in 2014/15)		
Data source(s):	Report not identified; Annual Review Report (2014/15 – page 23)		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The baseline has not been established nor is there independent sources of reporting outside of the Annual Review Report. The data has been collected and there is substantial evidence of work carried out.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considerable progress has been made since 2014 in appraising teachers using an approved appraisal form. A total of 715 primary and secondary teachers have been appraised and 131 have already been reappraised following in-service training. A significant amount of the teachers do not meet the standards. 2. The instrument is comprehensive covering 3 Areas (knowledge, practice, attribute); 15 Categories and 90 indicators. The tool uses a 5-point scale with defined evidence and descriptors for each indicator. The tool does not include sufficient background data such as gender, qualifications, institution where studied, years of experience. 		

Indicator:	8. Number of schools meeting minimum service standards related to literacy and numeracy		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	Not determined	Target:	Not determined
Reported - actual:	No information provided		
Data source(s):	Report not identified		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	No information available on the minimum service standards related to literacy and numeracy. This means that baseline situation has not been determined thus making it impossible to move forward with the monitoring and verifying of the schools meeting the minimum service standards.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No documentation or definition available on the minimum service standards for schools. 2. Baseline situation yet to be determined. 		

Indicator:	9. Number of accredited courses provided by PSET providers		
Definition:	The definition and method of calculation have not been provided.		
Baseline:	Number: 6 (2012)	Target:	Number: 20
Reported - actual:	Number: 2 (bringing total to 8)		
Data source(s):	Annual Review Report 2014/2015; PSET Statistical Bulletins		
Achievement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	While the data is not provided in the PSET Statistical Bulletins to verify the number of accredited courses, SQA has provided official letters to PSET Providers for those accredited programs and these would be available to the public upon demand.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	1. SQA PSET Bulletin published March 2014 most recent available. Refers to 2013 academic year data which is pre ESSP, The Bulletin states that 'NUS Maritime programmes were the only Provider programmes accredited by SQA by 2013'. Two programmes at NUS Maritime are shown in the list under 'Engineering and Related Fields of Study'.		

Section 4. Summary

27. The IVP Team recommends that the DPs disburse full funding against one of the KPIs and 50 percent against one other. The recommendations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. IVP Team findings and recommendations

	Independently Verified			Recommendation
	Baseline	Definition	Achieved	
1 Literacy	Partial	Partial	No	No
2 Numeracy	Partial	Partial	No	No
3 PSET Grads / Employment	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial
4 Completion Rate	Partial	No	No	No
5 Transition / Year 13	No	No	No	No
6 Students with Disability	No	No	No	No
7 Teacher Standards	No	No	No	No
8 School MSS	No	Yes	No	No
9 Accredited Programs	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

28. While the final results may seem disappointing, it should be noted that all agencies are working towards achieving the key results with focused activities. There is a significant amount of data available but it is not presented in official documents such as the statistical digests and bulletins of the education agencies. Had this been done, it could have been possible to recommend full disbursement against 4 – 5 of the KPIs.

29. The following are key findings that the team found during the IVP:

- a) There is a lack of agreed definitions for the KPIs and agreed methods of calculation across virtually all of the KPIs. These should follow the internationally recognized standards.
- b) The presentation of the data is not consistent or following standardised formats across the years. This makes it difficult to follow the trends and measure progress. Some of the data is not disaggregated sufficiently including gender, level or location.
- c) Two of the main sources of the data are published and easily available to the public – the MESC Statistical Digest and the SQA Statistical Bulletin. Other sources are not easily found such as data from NUS. It was not possible to locate the baselines or results of all the KPIs in the sources.
- d) There is a very significant amount of data that is unofficial and located in different ‘databases’ throughout the agencies. This is particularly true in MESC where many of the relevant data is sitting in the computers of educational officials. This is a huge risk as the data is not available if the officer is not present. In addition, there is a very serious risk of losing data if there is computer failure.

Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators for 2014 / 2015

Responsible Sector Agency	Key Outcome indicators	ESP code	Sub-category	2012 Baseline	2019 target
MESC	1. Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in literacy (English & Samoan)	SO1	Male	35%	23%
			Female	18%	12%
MESC	2. Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in numeracy.	SO1	Male	26%	10%
			Female	16%	5%
SQA NUS	3. Percentage of PSET graduates finding employment within 6 months (<i>gender disaggregated rates to be determined in first year of ESSP</i>)	SO3		31%	70%
MESC	4. Percentage of children commencing Year 1 Primary and completing Year 8 by gender (Primary Completion Rate MDG 2)	SO2	Male	86 (2014)	95%
			Female	85 (2014)	95%
MESC NUS SQA	5. Transition rate from Year 13 to formal PSET (target to be confirmed in year 1 of ESSP)	SO2	Male	37%	50%
			Female	63%	70%
MESC	6. Percentage of children with disability enrolled in mainstream government schools	O2.2		105 (in 2010)	150
MESC	7. Percentage of teachers meeting teacher performance standards	1.1.2		Appraisal process in place	TBD
MSEC	8. Number of schools meeting minimum service standards related to literacy and numeracy	2.1.2		TBD	50%
SQA	9. Number of accredited courses provided by PSET providers	1.5.1		6	20